This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Lewis · Vindication of the Society of Friends · 1834

C 8345 bb.10



C 8345.190.10

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY

THE GIFT OF

HAVERFORD COLLEGE LIBRARY

HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA

VINDICATION

OF THE

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS;

BEING

A REPLY TO A REVIEW

OF

COX ON QUAKERISM,

PUBLISHED IN THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

By ENOCH LEWIS.

He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him.—Prov. xviii. 13.

PHILADELPHIA:

NATHAN KITE, No. 50 NORTH FOURTH STREET.

Joseph & William Kite, Printers.

1834.

C 8345.190.10

✓HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
GIFT OF
FRIENDS HISTORICAL LIBRARY
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE
Feb 7, 1935

M

OBSERVATIONS

ON A

REVIEW OF COX ON QUAKERISM.

In the fourth number of the fifth volume of "The Biblical Repertory and Theological Review," edited in Princeton, New Jersey, and published in Philadelphia, we find a review of a work recently published by S. H. Cox, entitled "Quakerism not Christianity," &c. The author of the review, under the appearance, and perhaps with the intention of candour and liberality, has held up the Society of Friends, and the doctrines they profess, in a very unfavourable light. To those who are acquainted with the general character of Friends, or have taken the pains to understand their doctrines, and compare them with the testimony of Scripture, very little need be said, to show the weakness as well as the injustice of the attack, both of the author and his reviewer. If we could be assured that the readers of those productions would follow the example of the noble Bereans, and examine diligently with unbiassed minds, whether these things are so, we should feel little solicitude for the result. The author particularly has manifested a spirit which must satisfy any pious mind, that whatever errors or defects may be attributed to the people whose character he professes to delineate, *he* is not the man from whom correct information is to be expected. It is therefore intended to leave him and his work to be judged by such as may choose to peruse it, and to take no further notice of either,

than what may appear needful to expose the errors of his reviewer.

As the latter has professed to give to his readers not merely a criticism on the work of S. H. Cox, but a general account of the principles of Friends, and in this part of his labour has presented a view which may very possibly mislead those who are but little conversant with the subject; it may not be amiss to correct a few of the errors into which, from ignorance or prejudice, he has certainly fallen.

Believing, as I seriously do, that the doctrines held by the Society of Friends, are essentially the doctrines of the Gospel; and that a practical conformity to them, leads to that godliness, which, as the apostle declares, has the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come, I cannot but consider an attempt to degrade them, as an effort, though possibly an unconscious one, to obstruct the progress of vital Christianity, and consequently of sound morality in the world.

The defence of this society, merely as a society, is comparatively, a matter of little importance. It is, however, of incalculable importance, that sound principles should be maintained; especially when they lead directly to great practical results. Now, without arrogating to Friends an influence which does not belong to them, we must admit that many of the improvements of civil society for which these latter ages are remarkable, are the result of the principles which they, more conspicuously than any other people, have espoused and maintained. I do not inquire how far they, as a society, have been instrumental in the production of these improvements; it is sufficient for my purpose, that their principles, by whomsoever adopted, have been the efficient cause. Why were Friends the early and unanimous opponents of the slave trade; but because the traffic was *repugnant to* their religious

principles? How has it happened, that for half a century, there has not been, on the American continent, a single slave retained by an acknowledged member of the society, but because their principles were friendly to the rights of man? Why are wars less savage and sanguinary now than they formerly were; but because the principles of peace, have been silently making their way in the world? Why is religious toleration so generally admitted, but because the principles for which Friends have always contended, have, to a certain extent, been introduced into general legislation? Why has Pennsylvania taken the lead in the improvement of her penal code, but because the general tenor of her institutions partook of the character and principles of her founder?

If then the principles of Friends have been found, so far as they have been adopted, productive of beneficial results, it appears that the community at large, no less than the members themselves, are deeply interested in their support. As an advocate therefore of the truth, and the friend of morality and religion, rather than the defender of my own particular society, the following observations are submitted to the serious perusal of the reader.

The reviewer commences with the profession of a deep sense of his incompetency for the task he had undertaken. This, to some readers, may appear as mere common place. I however, give him credit for sincerity. In the first place his object evidently is to recommend to public favour, a ponderous volume, which according to his own account of it, is highly exceptionable, and much more likely to injure than promote the cause of religion. In the next place, he, in effect, acknowledges he does not understand the subject on which he is going to write. On this latter point I fully agree with him. Had he understood what the doctrines of the Society of Friends really are, he certainly could not have held up such a distorted caricature

to the public gaze. With such a task, and such qualifications, the wonder is, not that he should feel a sense of incompetency, but that he could reconcile his conscience to the undertaking.

When he greets us at the threshold, with the declaration, that, were he "to undertake to separate the chaff from the wheat, by rhetorical rule, he would, to a great extent, annihilate the originality and spirit" of his author's composition, what is that but to acknowledge that the *chaff* constitutes the spirit and essence of the volume? A sorry account of a work, on religious subjects, written by a professed minister of the Gospel.

It is asserted above, that according to the reviewer's account, the work in question, is more likely to injure than promote the cause of religion. Let any sober Christian examine the following passage, and decide for himself, whether the assertion is not fully sustained by it. "It is a most *amusing* book. This might be easily enough inferred from what we have said already. Besides the multiplied instances of pseudo-English and of Latin quotation to which we have just referred, the book teems with genuine wit. This is evidently a prominent ingredient in the composition of the doctor's mind, and in the present work there is certainly no effort to repress it. We doubt whether it would be possible, even for a Quaker, to read some parts of it, without finding his accustomed gravity disturbed, though he might hold in perfect abhorrence the sentiments inculcated. This characteristic certainly gives it one important advantage, inasmuch as it beguiles the reader of the tedium which might otherwise be occasioned by the perusal of so large a volume. We assure our readers, who may hesitate to encounter it, on account of its size, that from the beginning to the end of it, they will find nothing dry or prosing; and we should not be surprised, if, when they have once ascertained its character,

instead of making haste to finish it, as if it were a task, they should lay it by to be taken in small potions as an antidote to low spirits. Nevertheless, we are not quite sure but that, considering the subjects on which the author writes, he has scattered through his volume an undue proportion of humour. The subject is a serious one, and involves the most momentous interests of man, and though the doctor has certainly intended on the whole to treat it seriously, yet we think the inveterate playfulness of his mind, has sometimes thrown around it a ludicrous air which his own better judgment would hardly approve. In reading some portions of it, we can hardly repress the fear that *we are laughing where we ought to be sober*, and not merely at the expense of the Quakers, but, indirectly at least, *at the expense of divine truth.*" Is a work, ostensibly designed to illustrate the doctrines of the Gospel, in which wit and humour are the "prominent ingredients"—a work which would excite a smile, even in those who should "abhor its sentiments"—a book to be taken up as a jest book, and read in detached portions when we might wish to laugh at serious things—such an one as any man, who pays even a decent respect to religion, could conscientiously advise either young or old to read? Is an author who treats the solemn subject of the soul's salvation with levity—who is so totally destitute of the feeling which such a subject demands, as to be unable, notwithstanding his efforts at seriousness, to give it any other than a ludicrous air, the kind of guide, whom the really awakened pilgrim would wish to consult in his inquiries after the right way of the Lord? And what are we to think of the commentator who can recommend such a book, and for such reasons, to the favour of his reader? If *he* "could hardly repress the fear that he was laughing at the expense of divine truth," while reading some portions of this "most amusing book," did the thought never occur to him, that

some of his readers, who might be induced by his recommendation to read it, might possibly find their propensity to "laugh at the expense of divine truth," so far increased as to lose their relish for serious subjects, and become prepared to occupy the seat of the scornful?

If the work is actually such, as the above quotation represents it to be, we can hardly resist the conclusion, that it is even worse than the works of Voltaire and his infidel school. Those, who are content to laugh at the expense of divine truth, may be sufficiently gratified by this class of writers. Wit as sparkling as that of Dr. Cox, they unquestionably exhibit; and *perhaps* vulgarity as coarse, may be found in some of them; but the reader who ventures to peruse them, is more likely to be on his guard than in the case before us. They *openly* appear as the *opponents*, not the advocates, of the Christian religion.

It is well known that ridicule is the weapon with which the cause of piety has, in all ages, been most successfully assailed; and that upon which the infidel chiefly relies. Wit and satire are often employed to supply the want of argument. But the writer on religious topics, whose aim is truth, and whose mind is deeply impressed with the awfulness of his subject, can hardly fail to maintain the gravity which the words of truth and soberness require. The serious advocate of truth must be aware that the discussion of solemn subjects in a light and frivolous manner, must strike the mind of the sincere inquirer with disgust, and bring the cause of religion itself into contempt, in the view of the inconsiderate and unstable.

Immediately following the passage above cited, our reviewer informs us, that the book is a *highly instructive* one. For this two reasons are given. In the first place, his author is said to be thoroughly read in the standard works of the sect. What advantage this could be, supposing the fact to be correctly stated, is not altogether

obvious, if we are to admit the truth of the reviewer's previous assertion, that "there is so much of mysticism belonging to the system of the Quakers, and so much apparent contradiction in their standard authors, as to render it nearly a hopeless task to arrive at any thing like certainty in respect to what really constitute their distinguishing tenets." This passage aims a blow at the doctrines of Friends which recoils on its author. Though I am far from admitting the correctness of the statement, I think one important inference is clearly deducible from the passage. If a person should gravely assert that the writings of Euclid and Appolonius were unintelligible, or, as some ignorant critics have done, that Newton's exposition of the tides was contradictory, the necessary conclusion would be, not that these fathers of science were chargeable with the defects attributed to them, but that the objector had never made himself master of their doctrines. It must indeed appear, from the passage just quoted, as well as several others, that neither the perusal of our standard works, nor his author's exposition of them, has enabled the reviewer to understand the doctrines which he and his author have agreed to condemn. How then could he decide whether the latter understood them or not? If he did not, the circumstance of his having *read* them would probably contribute as little to the edification of his readers as it had to himself.

His second reason was copied from the title page of his author. He had been *twenty years* a member of the Society of Friends. If other parts of the essay did not exclude the supposition, we might readily imagine that this observation was designed as a burlesque on his author. From the prominence with which this circumstance is exhibited in the title page, an incautious reader, would almost necessarily conclude, that these twenty years must have been the years of manhood, or at least, the years of

discretion. If this was not the impression intended to be made, it is not easy to explain the apparent importance attached to it. The reviewer however does not appear to have been deceived by it. He seems to have understood the meaning of this momentous annunciation. His author had been allowed the privilege, which children whose parents are Friends are always allowed, until forfeited or renounced by themselves. That privilege it appears, moreover, was possessed, however it may have been used, until he was within about one year of legal age. As it is generally understood that young men during their minority are under the care of parents or guardians, the instances are very rare indeed, in which the discipline of the society is so far applied to them, as to exclude them from membership, until they attain the age of twenty-one. The case before us, however, is one of those rare ones. S. H. Cox, it appears, was regularly disowned, about a year before he was competent to engage in the usual vocations of men. And from his own account, it appears highly probably that if the overseers, whose duty it is to bring the conduct of delinquent members into the view of their meetings, had been apprised of the course he was pursuing, he might have been testified against sooner than he was. His attendance of the theatre, had it been known, would very probably have led to that result. Yet we are told, as a matter of great importance, that he had been for about twenty years one of the sect; was educated in all their peculiarities; was conversant with their most distinguished preachers; was a regular attendant upon their meetings, and had the *best possible opportunities* of knowing both what they believe and practise. It is unquestionably true, that he was for a time educated in the peculiarities of Friends, but this must have been during childhood, as he is well known to have rejected those peculiarities at a very early age. That he was a wild, erratic youth, who

never regarded the rules or principles of Friends, any longer than he was restrained, by parental or other authority, cannot be denied.

His acquaintance with the most distinguished preachers appears, from his own account, to have extended but little beyond Elias Hicks, and another who joined his standard. If it was from these sources, he derived his knowledge of the principles of Friends, his acquaintance was not likely to be very accurate. If a mere education in the society, and the attendance of our meetings, during a few of the earliest years of life, must necessarily have brought such a boy as he was, into an intimate knowledge of our practice and belief, there was little reason to complain of the great deficiency of religious instruction, which the reviewer in a subsequent passage so pathetically deplores. The assertion that he had the best possible opportunity of knowing both what Friends believed and practised is too reckless to merit a reply. I would not willingly charge the reviewer with intentional misrepresentation, yet it is scarcely possible to avoid the apprehension that he designed to mislead his readers, or was grossly deceived himself. A reader, unacquainted with the true state of the case, must suppose from the reviewer's account, that S. H. Cox had been a regular and consistent member, holding the principles of Friends, conforming to all their peculiarities, and associating upon equal terms with their most distinguished ministers; and that after such a life, of about twenty years, he had been induced, from a full conviction of the errors of their system, reluctantly to abandon the profession. The single fact as stated by himself, that he was, during a portion of these twenty years, in the practice of attending the theatre, is sufficient to show the discrepancy of the picture. That a young man who found the profession too great a restraint on his wayward passions, who knew little of it except as a standard which he

resolved never to follow, should, upon being touched with compunction for his irreligious course, take refuge in a society which allowed greater liberty to its professors, is not indeed a subject of surprise. Nor is it wonderful, if, finding himself ill at ease in his new profession, he should labour to convince himself and others, that there were numerous radical errors in the doctrines or practice of the society which he had abandoned. That this was the case with S. H. Cox appears very probable, from the manner in which he has treated the subject. If he really believed the system of Quakerism as erroneous as he attempted to make it appear, why did he not expose the error by sober argument? And if the standard authors contained the absurdities ascribed to them, where was the need of perverting their meaning.

It is observable, that although the reviewer appears fully sensible, that his author has treated the Society of Friends in a very harsh and abusive manner; and has manifested through the whole course of his work, a spirit totally incompatible with the meekness of the Christian character; yet instead of passing upon him and his book the censure, which, according to his own account, they justly deserve, an apology is industriously sought in the "peculiar character of his mind," as well as his circumstances and situation. The apology, however, as well as the conduct it palliates, is sadly defective. His mind, it is true, appears strongly marked with some *characteristics*, if not *peculiarities*, which a little acquaintance with the Gospel spirit must have regulated or controlled. But we are told, "he had been twenty years in bondage to the errors" which he was endeavouring to expose. What excuse that could furnish for treating with severity those who retain the profession, even supposing the profession erroneous, is not easily perceived. If we could believe that he had, for twenty years, sincerely and honestly held

the system and doctrines of Friends; and, at the end of that period, had as honestly adopted the opinions of Calvin, we must still suppose that he had with his change of opinion, imbibed a spirit directly the reverse of that which the doctrines of Friends inculcate, or he could not possibly manifest or indulge a disposition, such as his reviewer describes. But what are we to think of the assertion, that *he had been twenty years in bondage to the errors of the society?* Did the reviewer suppose that he was in bondage to an erroneous system of doctrines before he knew his right hand from his left? Or does he wish his reader to forget in what manner these *twenty years* were computed? The simple, unvarnished fact, that he was born within the pale of the society; never had any other than a juvenile connexion with it; paid little or no regard to its principles and restraints, even while he remained in nominal membership; and, finally renounced the profession altogether, and was disowned in his *twentieth year*, does not appear to have suited either the doctor or his reviewer.

The declaration that all this ridicule and severity are directed against the *doctrines* of the society and not against the *people*, is not only incorrect in fact, but impossible in the nature of things. Sober argument may apply to opinions, and these, if erroneous, may be exposed with the plainness of honest conviction; but sarcasm and ridicule have no application without a sensitive object. The reviewer, indeed, sufficiently contradicts his own assertion by the declaration that he should not be surprised if some of Cox's quondam friends, "should be willing to encounter the doctor with weapons more carnal than logic or sarcasm." This certainly implies that the attack was *personal*, not merely *doctrinal*. It also appears, that the reviewer supposed the abuse too gross and offensive to be patiently borne, even by the pacific Society of Friends.

Did he in this case judge of others by himself? The *personal* character of the attack is also excused by certain *personal* affronts, which his *preacher of the gospel* is said to have received. Friends, it is stated, have pursued him both with their written and oral communications. Are we to suppose that these personal affronts excited the doctor's zeal, and armed him with all the weapons of ridicule and sarcasm against the *doctrines* of his quondam brethren, but left him calm and placid towards the *persons* who had given the affronts? Or did the reviewer himself entertain, or wish others to adopt the opinion, that any member of the Society of Friends would be willing to resort to weapons more carnal than logic or sarcasm, to repel an attack which was aimed at their *doctrines*, and not at themselves?

It is not easy to determine exactly what is meant by the charge, that Friends have pursued his author, with their oral and written communications. From its being made the basis of an excuse for the harshness with which he has treated the society in general, as well as its juxtaposition with the act of excision, it would seem to imply that the society, in its collective capacity, had, subsequently to his disownment, made him the object of some official proceeding. The assertion, construed in that manner, may be confidently met by an unqualified denial. It is possible that some of his relatives or particular friends may have spoken and written to him on the subject of religion. But he may rest assured, that the space which he has occupied in the view of Friends, either since the publication of his book, or before it, was very small indeed. Nor is it very probable the case will be much changed in time to come. His ponderous volume will, in all probability, be left to find its way to oblivion, without any effort, on their part, to hasten its exit or prolong its date. It would appear like a work of supererogation for any of them to spend

their time in refuting it, when its avowed eulogist has found so much to condemn and so little to commend. As to the man himself, he is unquestionably considered as an object of pity rather than resentment. It is indeed a subject of serious regret, that any professor of the religion of Christ, should so far forget, or fail to understand, the purity and dignity of his profession, as to substitute the bitterness of invective for persuasion and argument; and his advocate may be assured that we have no wish to imbibe his spirit or imitate his example.

We are told that the book is strongly marked by a desire to do good. With the *motives* of the author, I have little concern. To his own master let him answer for his motives. It is obvious, however, from the reviewer's own account, that the means which he has adopted, and the spirit which pervades the work, are unfavourable, in the highest degree, to the attainment of good. And we can rest satisfied that the attempt, thus strenuously made, to render the society and its principles odious, will be as inefficient in its result, as it is unjustifiable in its means.

The conclusion deducible from this examination, is not a mere theoretical, but an important practical one—that the religion which the author in question, and his reviewer, are endeavouring to exalt on the ruins of Quakerism, is not the religion of Christ and his apostles. Their weapons were obtained from a different armoury.

The reviewer, having devoted about half a dozen pages to Samuel H. Cox's book, proceeds to what he calls a "general view of the system which the Quakers hold." This, from the space allotted to it, would appear to be the principal business of the essay. In the examination of this part of his labour, four things are particularly striking.

First. His very great want of acquaintance with the subject which he proposes to explain.

Second. His constant endeavour to establish, by some

kind of reasoning, a set of conclusions in direct opposition to the facts which he has expressly admitted.

Third. His frequent assumption, not of facts known to be true, but of such as his theory required.

Fourth. The vague and indefinite nature of the charges which he brings against the doctrines of Friends.

His want of acquaintance with the subject might be fairly inferred from his own repeated acknowledgment. He tells us in so many plain words, that his own "views are far from being settled in respect to what constituted the original doctrines of the society." And as he admits the correctness of the legal decision at Trenton, the acknowledgment must be equally applicable to the doctrines which they hold at the present day.* But we are not left to this testimony alone. The mists and mysticism of Quakerism seem to be the burden of his theme. What is this but a declaration that he cannot understand their doctrine. To discover that an opinion is really erroneous, it is necessary to penetrate the mists in which it is shroud-

---

* It may be proper here, once for all, to apprise the reader, that the writer of this article claims no religious communion with the followers of Elias Hicks. He considers the Separation as an effect resulting from the adoption, on their part, of opinions totally incompatible with the doctrines of Friends. What those opinions are, is of little importance in the present discussion. No inquiry is here intended whether the reviewer has represented them correctly or not. It is the Society of Friends, not the adherents of Elias Hicks, whose doctrines and character he is endeavouring to vindicate. He is also willing to leave to the reviewer the task of explaining how it has happened, if "the Quakerism of the Hicksites is, in all its substantial characteristics, the infidelity of David Hume," that his *minister of the Gospel* manifests the partiality to them, which he does. Is it from similarity of temper or congeniality of principle?

ed, and whatever ambiguity of language may be supposed to attend it, the doctrine of Friends, like every thing else, ceases to be mystical as soon as it is understood. A further evidence of want of acquaintance with his subject, is furnished by his numerous mistakes in point of fact. Not wishing to impeach his veracity, I adopt the only alternative, that of imputing to ignorance, the discrepancy between his statements and the sober truth. Who, that has a character to preserve or lose, would willingly hazard his reputation by giving publicity to misrepresentations so easily exposed? The assertion, that "in those points which relate immediately to the economy of human salvation, the most orthodox Quakerism, so far as we are able to understand it, is thoroughly Arminian," or, as it is elsewhere expressed, that "the system is in its best form, a species of mystified Arminianism," manifests an ignorance of the subject or a vagueness of expression, hardly excusable in a volunteer expositor of their doctrines. It is true that Friends agree with the Arminians in the denial of the Calvinistic doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation. Yet even on this point, the Arminian doctrine includes some speculations which never appear in the writings of Friends. They also, with the Arminians, agree that the atonement was made, not as the Calvinists assert, for an elect few, but for all mankind. But they do not adopt the article of the Arminian creed, which furnishes the strongest argument to their Calvinistic opponents, the absolute necessity of a knowledge of the history of the life and death of the Messiah, to render it availing to salvation. Friends do not adopt the opinions of Arminius, or any other writer ancient or modern, any further than they appear consistent with the testimony of the sacred writings. The history of George Fox's life, clearly shows that he was a diligent reader of the Holy Scriptures, and carefully attentive to the manifestations of divine truth

in his own mind; but that the laboured productions of divinity professors had no part in the formation of his doctrinal opinions. The numerous instances in which Robert Barclay points out the difference between the doctrines of Friends, and those held by the Arminians,* are amply sufficient to prove the incorrectness of the reviewer's assertion.

His brief historical view of the society, would have been somewhat more instructive, if he had followed more closely the best accounts of the time. Had he told us, as he certainly might, that the persecutions to which, in the early periods of the society, Friends were subjected, were principally excited by the clergy, he would have cast a strong light on the unpardonable sin of Quakerism. It might have appeared, that their unflinching testimony for a free gospel ministry, and their unqualified denunciation of the practice of preaching for hire and divining for money, aroused the indignation of the whole clerical body, and raised, through their means, the secular arm against them. This piece of historical information, would have been the more instructive and appropriate, as it would probably have explained, if it did not excuse, his author's severity towards their successors.

In this part of his progress he has needlessly turned out of his way, to notice the persecutions in New England. While he admits that the conduct of the New England persecutors was totally irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel, and incapable of rational defence, he seems to forget that these barbarities were stimulated and encouraged by the professed ministers of religion; and endeavours to palliate those atrocities which the common sense of the present age has agreed to condemn. He conceives

---

* See pages 110. 129. 148. 177. 373, of his Apology.

that much allowance must be made on account of the spirit of the age, and the imperfect knowledge then possessed of the rights of man. Besides, he says, "*it is not to be forgotten* that the conduct of the Quakers was, in many instances, exceedingly reprehensible. It is matter of historical record, that they frequently entered religious assemblies of other denominations, *with a view to disturb their worship*; calling their preachers by the most approbrious epithets." Here one or two observations seem naturally to arise. If Friends were really guilty of disturbing the peace of the community, why did they not enact laws to prohibit or punish for the offensive acts, and not punish every one who bore the name of a Quaker, whether guilty of any misdemeanor or not.

As their laws were enacted, not against disturbers of the public peace, but against the Quakers, simply as such, we have a strong negative evidence, that they really had no palpable misdemeanors to charge against them. The first individuals of this society who visited New England, were Mary Fisher and Ann Austin, who arrived in the Boston road in the summer of 1656. Though there was then, no law in the colony against the Quakers, these women were seized on board the vessels, stripped of their property, and committed to prison, where they were treated with the greatest barbarity; and after several weeks of close confinement, they were sent away without being charged with a crime, or allowed the opportunity of committing an offence. Others who arrived soon afterwards were treated with equal barbarity, and expelled the country in a similar manner. They were seized, confined and banished, without being charged with the violation of law, but simply because they were Quakers. Laws were soon enacted, to prevent their introduction, or to banish them when they came, upon the solitary ground of their religious profession.

As it is generally understood that the people of the present day are possessed of much more liberal and tolerant principles, there is no disposition on the part of Friends, to reproach them with the conduct of their ancestors. Far be it from us to insinuate, that there is any analogy between the character of those persecutors, and that of their successors in religious profession of the present times, unless the latter should prove that they allow the deeds of their fathers, by attempting to palliate them.

The reviewer appears anxious to persuade his readers, that there is some serious and radical error in the doctrines of Friends, and that their evil tendency has been too much overlooked. What those evil tendencies are, he has not condescended to explain. He has, however, I admit, given a tolerably satisfactory reason, why they have been so generally overlooked. It seems indeed difficult, even for a professed advocate, to find a better. It is in plain English, nothing else than this; they are totally invisible. If the fact is, as he admits it to be, that the system has for the most part justly claimed a peculiarly inoffensive character; has been found zealously enlisted against great and acknowledged evils; has been honest in its dealings, and exemplary in its morality; what reason is there to suppose, that "a system which has led to so many good results," and is not shown to have led to any bad ones, "is materially at variance with the law and the testimony." Has the reviewer discovered a safer criterion than that selected by the lip of wisdom,—The tree is known by its fruit? Or does he suppose that grapes *are now* to be gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles? To such an objector as this, we may reply in the language of the Apostle, "show me thy faith without works, and I will show thee my faith by my works."

He pronounces a just, though limited eulogium, on the character of William Penn; plainly showing that the prin-

ciples upon which *he* acted must have been excellent in practice, whatever they were in theory; while the only objection which he makes to him or his writings, is the stale and hackneyed one, that they are shrouded in the mists of Quakerism. When we contemplate the character of that eminent legislator; when we behold the remarkable benevolence, conspicuous in every part of his political career; his treatment of the simple aborigines, so widely different from that of most other settlers of colonies; when we trace in the laws suggested by his wisdom, or enacted under his superintendence, the germs of many important improvements, which succeeding ages have matured; and connect with these the reflection, that William Penn made religion the business of his life, and the great moving spring of all his actions; the conviction is forced upon us, that the world is more indebted to his religion, than to his talents, great as they certainly were, for the excellence of his institutions. The policy of his government grew out of his religious principles. A legislator of different principles could neither have established nor maintained such a government as his. And it is certainly a remarkable fact, that the only member of the Society of Friends, who ever possessed any very extensive political power, was able to establish a government which has commanded the applause of the world. That he planted a colony in the midst of savage tribes, whom he disarmed by his kindness, and preserved his people in peace, without the aid of fortifications or arms. That his treaties with the natives were never infringed; and that no evidence appears that a drop of English blood was ever shed by an Indian tomahawk, on the land which he purchased of them. Do not these facts prove, if facts prove any thing, that the principles of Quakerism, so far from being of evil tendency, are not only inoffensive in private life, but highly conducive to national prosperity? It is not easy to conjecture

from what article of their creed the reviewer or his author drew the conclusion, that it was from "the original greatness of his mind, and the general benevolence of his feelings, rather than from any result of appropriate evangelical influence," that William Penn, was enabled to maintain such strict integrity in every part of his conduct; and to evince, amidst the trials of life, so great a degree of resignation to the divine will, and of trust in the government of God. The insinuation looks more like a desperate effort to attribute the acknowledged excellencies of the man to any cause but his religious principles, than a candid exhibition of character, or the deduction of a rational philosophy.

The reviewer, it appears, has lately become acquainted with the character of John Woolman, and admits that his "piety deserves to be known and imitated by all denominations." "His journal, and other writings," says he, "have been published; and though they certainly savour of the strange enthusiasm of the sect, and show that his mind was in bondage to *some of their less exceptionable peculiarities*, yet they exhibit in a high degree some of the loveliest features of Christian character; and we do not believe that any impartial reader of them, can resist the conviction, that they were dictated by a heart which consented fully to the leading peculiarities of the Gospel, and was used to intimate communion with the Saviour. Instances of this kind show, that Quakerism does not, in all cases at least, neutralize the genuine influence of the Gospel; though we are to make a distinction between the legitimate influence of a system, and accidental results from other influences which do not appropriately belong to it."

Hence it appears, that in the opinion of the reviewer, the piety of John Woolman was genuine. His errors would therefore appear to be those of the understanding and not of the heart. Quakerism, in this case at least, did

not neutralize the genuine influence of the gospel. The *peculiarities* to which he was in bondage, were not highly exceptionable. We are therefore to infer that *he* rejected all those peculiarities to which any important objections can be made. As the reviewer has not informed us in what particulars John Woolman differed from others of the society, we must look into his history, or his works, and make the discovery for ourselves. Such an examination will probably lead to the conclusion, that the conduct and opinions of John Woolman are obnoxious to every charge which the reviewer has advanced against the society; those only excepted which rest upon palpable error or sheer misrepresentation.

It is impossible to read attentively the works of John Woolman, without being convinced that he fully believed in the doctrine of *the inward light*, and that this belief was not with him a mere speculative theory, but a practical principle; the guide of his life, the regulator of his conduct, and the moving cause of every religious engagement. And that, even in his worldly employments, he was careful to keep a steady eye to the leadings and restrictions of this divine principle. This doctrine is therefore not highly exceptionable.

Upon another peculiarity, the opinions of John Woolman were not less clear and decided than those of Friends in the present day: I allude to their testimony in favour of a free gospel ministry. There is not the smallest intimation of his having ever received or paid a pecuniary compensation for preaching. On that subject he appears to have been remarkably sensitive; as must be evident to any one who reads, with attention, his own account of his visit to the south in 1757. He evidently construed the text strictly: "Freely ye have received, freely give." It would therefore appear that, in the opinion of the reviewer, this peculiarity is not highly objectionable.

In regard to plainness of dress, it is well known, that he was remarkable, even in the Society of Friends. No member of that society has ever been more *strictly* plain than he was; his language was also in consonance with that of his brethren in religious profession. Hence these peculiarities appear entitled to the reviewer's toleration.

It is rather singular that the reviewer, while endeavouring to expose the doctrines of Friends, and exhibit the evil tendency of the system, should pass such an eulogium on the piety of one, who was, probably, as complete a specimen of genuine Quakerism as the eighteenth century could produce. To suppose that the character of John Woolman was formed by accidental influences in opposition to the general tendency of the religious system which he embraced, is to suppose that all the great principles of his life were overborne and counteracted by some unknown and accidental influences.

The reviewer, it appears, has but *lately* become acquainted with the life and character of John Woolman, and perhaps if, instead of accepting Dr. Cox's caricature for a portrait, he had taken the pains to become acquainted with the lives of a few more of the most consistent members (and from such specimens the tendency of the system ought to be tried), he might have discovered, that what he considers as exceptions, actually constitute the rule; and that the principles of Quakerism do not, in any instance, neutralize the influence of the Gospel. In the case of John Woolman, as well as that of William Penn, we are presented with an awkward attempt to elude the force of admitted and undeniable facts, and to arrive at a conclusion which the inductive philosophy does not warrant.*

---

* It is one of Dr. Cox's charges against Robert Barclay, that, in his Apology, he no where quotes the philosophy of Ba-

The reviewer advances the opinion that "Quakerism is adapted to cramp the faculties and retard intellectual improvement." "This," says he, "we might infer from the general fact, that it is at best an *adulterated kind of Christianity;* and as Christianity in its genuine form is adapted, in various ways, to invigorate and exalt the intellectual powers, so just in proportion as it assumes a spurious character it loses its quickening power over the human intellect."

Previous to inquiring into the philosophy of this passage, let us consider what must be the result of the theory, supposing it correct. If Quakerism tends to cramp the intellect, ought we not to find an undue proportion of the members, particularly the more strict and consistent ones engaged in the lowest employments? Should we not meet with them in great numbers, in our cities, occupied as scavengers, hostlers, oystermen, wood-sawyers, &c.; and in the country as day-labourers and servants in the families of other professors? The case, however, turns out to be, that Friends are obliged to depend very much upon other persons for the performance of these menial services, from the impossibility of procuring any of their own profession to perform them. The well known fact that very few of them are found in those situations which are usually occupied by the lowest order of intellect, is of itself sufficient to prove the unsoundness of the theory before us.

To return to his argument; I should not dispute his

---

con. If he does not quote it, he certainly maintains the spirit of it much better than the author before us. Bacon's plan is to draw our conclusions, by well connected reasoning, from facts or principles clearly established, and not from vague hypotheses or gratuitous assumptions.

inference if he had fairly established his premises. But when or where was it proved that Quakerism is an adulterated kind of Christianity? From what immediately follows, it is obvious that one of the most offensive adulterations, and that one which probably comes nearest the reviewer's heart, rela es to the ministry which Friends admit and approve. It is undoubtedly an important question, worthy of the serious consideration both of those who support and of those who condemn it, whether the ministry advocated by Friends is, or is not, consistent with genuine Christianity. If we are to judge of this ministry by its effects, and of its effects by the general character of the members, the facts expressly admitted by the reviewer himself, must produce a verdict in its favour. If we are to examine the question as a theoretical one, we must take the theory which Friends have espoused, and compare it with the first and purest age of Christianity.

"The ministry and ministers we plead for, are such as are immediately called and sent forth by Christ and his spirit unto the work of the ministry; so were the holy apostles and prophets, as appears by these places, Matt. x. 1. 5. Eph. iv. 11. Heb. v. 4.

"The ministers we plead for, are such as are actuated and led by God's spirit, and by the power and operation of his grace in their hearts, are in some measure converted and regenerate, and so are good, holy and gracious men; such were the holy prophets and apostles, as appears from 1 Tim. iii, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Tit. i. 7, 8, 9.

"The ministers we plead for, are such as act, move and labour in the work of the ministry, not from their own mere natural strength and ability, but as they are actuated, moved, supported, assisted and influenced by the Spirit of God, and minister according to the gift received, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God: such were the ho-

ly prophets and apostles. 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. 1 Cor. i. 17. ii. 3, 4, 5. 13. Acts, ii. 4. Matt. x. 20. Mark, xiii. 11. Luke xii. 12. 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

"The ministers we plead for, are such as, being holy and humble, contend not for precedency and priority, but rather strive to prefer one another, and serve one another in love; neither desire to be distinguished from the rest by their garments and large phylacteries, nor seek greetings in the market-places, nor uppermost places at feasts, nor the chief seats in the synagogues; nor yet to be called of men, master, &c. Such were the holy prophets and apostles, as appears from Matt. xxiii. 8, 9, 10, and xx. 25, 26, 27.

"The ministers we plead for, are such as having freely received, freely give; who covet no man's silver, gold or garments; who seek no man's goods, but seek them, and the salvation of their souls; whose hands supply their own necessities, working honestly for bread to themselves and their families. And if at any time they be called of God, so as the work of the Lord hinder them from the use of their trades, take what is freely given them by such to whom they have communicated spirituals; and having food and raiment are therewith content: such were the holy prophets and apostles, as appears from Matt. x. 8. Acts xx. 33, 34, 35. 1 Tim. vi. 8.

"And in a word, we are for a holy, spiritual, pure and living ministry, where the ministers are both called, qualified and ordered, actuated and influenced in all the steps of their ministry by the Spirit of God; which being wanting we judge they cease to be the ministers of Christ."*

But the ministers whom the reviewer approves, are those who are "trained for the purpose," and thoroughly

* Barclay's Apology, p. 340, &c.

educated in the art and trade of preaching. There is no doubt that such teachers may be able ministers of the letter, well qualified to instruct their hearers in the doctrines and commandments of men. But are men thus prepared and qualified, *ministers of the Gospel*, unless they are also called and qualified by the Holy Ghost? "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Whence it follows, that to be a minister of the Gospel, it is absolutely necessary to receive a dispensation of the Gospel, and this cannot possibly be given by man, but must come from God. The apostles, who accompanied the Saviour during his ministry on earth, who saw his miracles, who heard immediately from his lips the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth —who could, no doubt, repeat from memory many of his sayings—who were witnesses of his resurrection—and who ate and drank with him after his passion—these must have been qualified, if any men ever were, to preach the Gospel without superiour assistance. Yet they were commanded to tarry at Jerusalem, till they were endued with power from on high. When they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and not till then, they began their ministry.

This was the promise of the Father, a teacher to abide with them forever, even the Spirit of Truth, which should be in them and teach them what they should say. And we find that their preaching is always attributed to the operations of the same spirit. The apostle Peter, on the memorable day of pentecost, declared the prophecy of Joel then fulfilled: "Behold it shall come to pass in the last days (saith God) that I will pour out of my spirit on *all flesh*; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." This, we observe, was to be in the last days, or under the last dispensation of God to man, and the prophesying was to be under the influence of the

Spirit thus to be poured upon all flesh. But the reviewer informs us, that "inspiration has long since passed away;" and of course his apprehension of a pure Gospel ministry must exclude an indispensable qualification, the present effusion of the Holy Ghost; for what is divine inspiration but the immediate teaching of the spirit of Christ? It therefore appears, that what the reviewer dignifies with the name of *Gospel ministry*, is not properly "an adulterated kind of Christianity," but a dereliction of the original principles of the Gospel, and a substitution of the natural and acquired abilities of man. We hence readily discover that his opposition to the ministry of Friends, is very much like that of Diana's craftsmen to the ministry of the apostles.

The account which the reviewer has given of the ministry of Friends, seems not very different from that which the apostle gives of his own: "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom;" whether the closing part of his description is applicable or not, "but in demonstration of the *Spirit* and of power," he sufficiently proves himself incompetent to decide. For how can one who believes that inspiration has totally ceased, determine whether a religious communication proceeds from a divine source or not?

The assertion so confidently made, that "their preaching *generally* consists of a *few* common-place remarks on some mystical subject, or at best some topic of morality," proves, if it proves any thing, that the writer is very little acquainted with the subject before him. He probably has seldom, if ever, attended the meetings of Friends, and therefore cannot possibly know what kind of preaching they *generally* have. Had he been accustomed to hearing their preaching, he must have known that when a *few remarks* only are made, they are *mostly* couched in Scripture language. The reproach of being tame and common-place, must therefore fall on the Scriptures. A gross and offen-

sive imputation. That topics of mere morality constitute the sermons of our ministers, is so far from being true, that sound morality is always held up as the *result* not the *essence* of the religion to which the audience are directed. He would probably have treated the subject of silent meetings with less contempt, if he had duly attended to those Scripture passages, in which *silence* is so solemnly and emphatically enjoined. "Keep silence before me, O islands, and let the people renew their strength—let them *come near*, then let them speak," Isa. xli. 1. "Be silent, O all flesh, before the Lord," Zec. ii. 13. "The Lord is in his holy temple, let all the earth keep silence before him," Hab. ii. 20.

The reviewer proceeds to assert, that "it is a striking attribute of Quakerism, that it discourages free and independent thought." "The children of the sect are strongly impressed with its peculiar dogmas as early, perhaps earlier than they can possibly understand them; and to call in question these dogmas, they are taught to consider a wilful sin against the inward light—a most gross and capital heresy." "In consequence of the restraint to which they are subjected in the formation of their earliest opinions, it comes to pass that these opinions afterwards, instead of being moulded by their own enlightened reflection, and subjected to the test of Scripture and common sense, are little else than mere prejudices; and instead of forming a habit of independent thought, and impartial judgment, there is every probability that they will, to a great extent, surrender the right of thinking for themselves, and tamely confide in the dictation of the oracles of the sect."

He appears, in this case, to have made a mistake nearly similar to one committed by an eminent advocate in one of our southern courts, who forgot on which side he was retained, and commenced his argument in opposition to his client. One or two of his expressions, it is true, serve to

show that he had not *altogether* forgot the side on which he was engaged; but he must have drawn his portrait from a society with which he was much better acquainted than with the Society of Friends. The features of the original are indeed tolerably well preserved in the picture. It is the labelling that is wrong.

It is generally admitted, and probably never denied in this country, that a republican government is much more favourable to the development of intellect, than a monarchy or aristocracy. What a republic is, compared with an aristocracy, in political life, such are the religious institutions of Friends, compared with those which the reviewer attempts to support. The exercise of the ministry with us is not confined to a particular *order of men trained for the purpose*, but left open to all, of either sex, who may be divinely called and qualified for the service. Every station in the church is open to any one who has received, and properly improved, the talents which the station requires. The general discipline of the society is settled, and its execution conducted, in meetings which all our members may attend. In the deliberations of those assemblies, the young as well as the old are allowed to participate. It is remarkable that Thomas Clarkson, well known for his labours in behalf of the African race, and who is probably better acquainted with the Society of Friends than any other man who never belonged to it, represents independence of mind, as one of the striking characteristics of its members; and that he deduces this trait from the nature of their religious institutions.* The general reception of dogmas relative to faith and practice, without examination or comparison with Scripture testimony, is scarcely compatible with the admission of that portion of our belief

* Portraiture of Quakerism, vol. iii. page 181, &c.

which the reviewer so frequently makes the subject of taunting remark, viz. the doctrine of an inward light. For how is it possible to believe that a measure of the Spirit of Truth is given to every man to profit withal; that by taking heed to the manifestations of this spirit we are to understand the doctrines of the Gospel, or to know, with satisfactory clearness, our individual duties; and yet to rest our faith on a set of unexamined dogmas, depending entirely on the opinions of men as fallible as ourselves? Those very peculiarities, which the reviewer appears to consider as indications of an implicit surrender of the judgment to the "dogmas of the sect," can hardly fail to lead to examination and sober reflection. The young man who finds himself surrounded by people of highly respectable character, who freely indulge in numerous practices, which his education has taught him to deny, is forcibly impelled, either to reject the peculiarities of his profession without examination, or to inquire, deeply and seriously, why the society to which he belongs, should be thus distinguished from most other professors of the Christian name. And we may be assured that few, in the early walks of life, will so far disregard the influence of general example, as to conform very closely to the peculiarities of their education, unless they find something more than mere prescription to bind them to the observance.

The system of Quakerism, both in its doctrine and discipline, is more completely calculated to excite examination and independent thought, than any other with which I am acquainted. As to submitting our opinions to the test of Scripture and common sense, it will be time enough to charge us with deficiency, when we are proved to hold some peculiar tenet which the Scriptures, and a sound rationality, do not support. Of the conformity of our doctrines to Scripture testimony, more will appear in the sequel.

He proceeds to state, that "Quakerism is unfriendly to intellectual culture, inasmuch as it it keeps the mind conversant with *trifling things*, and magnifies their importance by elevating them into the fundamental peculiarities of the sect." Here, as before, he is pleading on the wrong side. For it appears by his specifications, that this general charge is founded on the practice of Friends using a plain dress, speaking in correct Scripture language, and calling each other by their proper names. In other words, we are judged to be employed in trifling things, because we do not think proper to vary the cut and colour of our clothing, to suit the freaks and fancies of an ever-varying world. Whether we regard the dignity of the philosopher, or the humility of the Christian, we shall arrive at the conclusion, that plain apparel, adapted to the real purposes of dress, not calculated to foster pride, is most consistent with genuine wisdom. But how a writer, who professes to set so high a value upon the Holy Scriptures, can reprove us for putting in practice what they so frequently advise, is not easily conceived. Does he mean to tell us, that the prophets and apostles, and even Jesus Christ himself, wished to engage the believers in trifling things? "Why take ye thought (or why are ye anxious) for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow, they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these." Matt. vi. 28, 29. "I will that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array. But, which becometh women professing godliness, with good works." 1 Tim. ii. 9. "Whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, and of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is incorruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit,

which is, in the sight of God, of great price." 1 Pet. iii. 3, 4. See also, Isaiah, iii. 16—20, for a severe rebuke of superfluity in dress. Now, the object which the Society of Friends have in view, is, to maintain that sobriety of dress which the apostles commend; and to avoid those excesses which are so solemnly reproved. If the observance of this practice is a *peculiarity*, it is not our fault. The apostle did not make it a condition, that the Christian women must not be *peculiar*. They were to do what was proper, whether others followed the example or not.

Again, are we triflers because we observe the apostolic injunction, "to hold fast the form of sound words;" and avoid a corruption which originated in the gross and fulsome adulation paid to the Roman emperors during the decline of that empire? Were Luther and Erasmus triflers, because they expressed their dislike of the confusion of numbers which this servile flattery first introduced? If the use of Scripture language to each other is *trifling*, why do we all use it in our addresses to the Almighty? Would the reviewer tolerate the substitution of you, for thou and thee, in the prayers of Christians? Let the advocates of the Bible cease to be inconsistent with themselves, and the language of Friends will cease to be a *peculiarity*.

The reviewer seems to consider the use of a plain dress, the language of Scripture, and of our proper names, as matters of indifference; and yet as tending to degrade the intellect of those who adhere to them. What elevation the understanding obtains by using Mr. (a corruption of master) instead of the proper name, is difficult to discover. But certainly he showed little respect to the precepts of the Saviour, when he wrote the passage before us. "Be not ye called Rabbi (master) for one is your master even Christ, and all ye are brethren." The term Rabbi, appears to have been the Mr. of the apostolic age, which the dis-

ciples were not to receive, and consequently could not lawfully give to each other. If the term master, whether distinctly articulated, or minced into mister, is not strictly true when applied to those who possess no authority over us, it seems to be the business of others, rather than of Friends, to examine why the use of the proper name should be a peculiarity.

The reviewer proceeds, "it is perfectly well known, that as a sect they [the Society of Friends] have set themselves strongly against human learning; and hence up to a very recent period, it was a rare thing to find a well-educated man among them." A person unconnected with the society, may well be excused for knowing little respecting their efforts to promote the education of their youth; but it is not easy to frame a solid excuse for publishing to the world, as a well-known fact, what could not possibly be known at all; and what persons really acquainted with the case, must know to be untrue. That the Society of Friends, as a society, ever set themselves against human learning, is so far from being a well-known fact, that probably no other religious society has used such exertions as they have done, to promote a general diffusion of useful learning among their members.

As early as the year 1667, George Fox recommended the establishment of schools for the education of boys and girls, "in whatsoever things were useful and civil," a form of expression which bespeaks an enlargement of mind far beyond the mere elementary branches of education. Two schools were accordingly established, one at Waltham and the other at Shacklewell, and since that time not less than ten boarding schools have been founded by direction and under the patronage of the society in England and Ireland.

In the discipline of the Yearly Meeting of London, we find the following article, dated as early as 1695:

"Advised; that school masters and mistresses, who are faithful Friends and well qualified, be encouraged in all counties, cities, great towns, or other places where there may be need; and that care be taken that poor Friends' children may freely partake of such education as may tend to their benefit and advantage, in order to apprenticeship."

In our own country, the education of youth claimed the early attention of Friends. A charter was granted by William Penn, soon after the settlement of Philadelphia, to a board of overseers of public schools, one condition of which is, that they are to maintain a grammar school for the Latin and Greek languages.* A large amount of property is entrusted to this board, and a number of respectable seminaries are conducted under their care. A mathematical department, with a valuable philosophical apparatus, has been for many years included in the establishment. And although the trustees are all members of the Society of Friends, they do not limit their instruction to the children belonging to their own community.

The greatest efforts, however, of the society have always been, not to raise a few of their youth to distinguished

---

*This school appears to have been commenced in 1689; and a charter was obtained in 1697. This was afterwards renewed with revisions; the last being granted in 1711. The preamble shows that William Penn was no enemy to human learning. "Whereas, the prosperity and welfare of any people depend, in great measure, upon the good education of youth, and their early introduction into the principles of true religion and virtue, and qualifying them to serve their country and themselves, by breeding them in reading, writing and learning of languages and useful arts and sciences, suitable to their age, sex, and degree; which cannot be effected in any manner so well as by erecting public schools for the purposes aforesaid," &c.

eminence in science or literature, but to communicate to every member a competent portion of learning, to prepare them for the useful avocations of life. In this, they have, unquestionably, in great measure, succeeded.

By recurring to the minutes of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, for more than fifty years, we find the subject of schools one of frequent occurrence in the deliberations of that body. In the Book of Discipline of that Yearly Meeting we find the following:

"The education of our youth in piety and virtue, and giving them useful learning, under the tuition of religious prudent persons, having for many years engaged the solid attention of this meeting, and advices thereon having been from time to time issued to the several subordinate meetings; it is renewedly desired, that quarterly, monthly and preparative meetings, may be excited to proper exertions for the institution and support of schools; there being but little doubt, that as Friends are united, and cherish a disposition of liberality for the assistance of each other in this important work, they will be enabled to make such provision for the accommodation and residence of a teacher, with a family, as would be an encouragement to well-qualified persons, to engage in this arduous employment: for want of which, it has been observed, that children have been committed to the care of transient persons of doubtful character, and sometimes of very corrupt minds, by whose bad example and influence, they have been betrayed into principles and habits which have had an injurious effect on them in more advanced life. It is therefore indispensably incumbent on us to guard them against this danger, and procure such tutors of our own religious persuasion, as are not only capable of instructing them in useful learning, to fit them for the business of this life, but to train them in the knowledge of their duty to God, and one towards another. It is therefore proposed: First.

That a lot of ground be provided in each monthly or preparative meeting, sufficient for a garden, orchard, grass for a cow, &c., and a suitable house erected thereon.

"Second. That funds be raised by contribution, bequest, &c. in each meeting; the interest of which to be applied either in aid of the tutor's salary, or lessening the expense of Friends in straitened circumstances, in the education of their children.

"Third. That a committee be appointed in each monthly or preparative meeting, to have the care of schools, and the funds for their support, and that no tutor be employed but with their consent."

One of the queries addressed to the monthly meetings, and to which an answer is annually returned to the Yearly Meeting, is as follows:

"Are there schools established for the education of our youth, under the care of teachers in membership with us, and superintended by committees appointed either in the monthly or preparative meetings?"

The care to provide for the education of children, whose parents are in indigent circumstances, is enjoined as a religious duty. Witness the following query, also answered yearly in every monthly meeting:

"Are poor Friend's necessities duly inspected, and they relieved, or assisted in such business as they are capable of? Do their children freely partake of learning to fit them for business?"

In what other society is the duty of extending to all its members the benefits of education, so repeatedly urged, or so intimately incorporated with the system of church government?

The Yearly Meetings of New England, New York, and Philadelphia, have severally large boarding schools, superintended by committees appointed by those meetings respectively; and in all of them, provision is made for

bringing the means of instruction within the reach of the poor, as well as the rich. An establishment on similar principles is contemplated in the newly formed Yearly Meeting of Ohio.

If it should even appear that the Society of Friends have fallen short of their just proportion of members conspicuous for high attainments in science or literature, while a very small number of them can be justly ranked with the grossly illiterate, we should no more infer from that circumstance, the general ignorance of the society, than we should their general poverty from the fact of few instances of exorbitant wealth being found within its limits. But when we reflect, that in the United States, the Society of Friends do not compose one-hundredth part of the white population; and in England and Ireland, the relative number is still less, we easily discover that a very few eminent scholars would be our full quota of learned men. It would probably be no easy matter to furnish a list of an hundred English physicians of equal eminence, who were cotemporaries with Dr. Fothergill; or an hundred English writers in the present day, superior to Jonathan Dymond. If this should be done, we can easily furnish a few more.

The following paragraph might be mistaken for the production of an avowed deist, labouring to prostrate the whole system of Christianity. "Let the system be even what the most orthodox Quakers would claim, it has still we believe the doctrine of the *inward light;* and so long as this remains, we cannot conceive how they can avoid being enthusiasts. For let this light be what it may, whether reason, or conscience, or the *Holy Spirit*, or something else, it is evident that it has an office assigned to it which makes it paramount to God's word; and whatever a Quaker utters in the way of preaching, is from the promptings of this inward principle. We need not here attempt any proof of the position that the days of inspira-

tion, have long since gone by; but every Quaker preacher, at least, claims to be inspired; and those who are not preachers believe that he is so.. What then, if we confine our views to the simple matter of preaching, must be the result? Why nothing less, on the part of the preacher, than that any vain and ridiculous fancy that happens to occur to him, he is liable to give off with oracular authority: and nothing less on the part of the hearers, than that they are liable to be misled and deceived, by putting down what are literally old wives' fables, as the genuine suggestions of divine inspiration. This principle—and for aught we can see, it is the fundamental principle of the system—being once admitted, we need not be surprised at any degree of fanaticism that may be the result. The most childish whims, as well as the most destructive errors, *are thereby handed out*, under the sanction of God's authority; and with those who implicitly believe in the unerring guidance of the inward light, what hinders that they should become, even without examination, the governing principles of the conduct?"

If we are not shocked with the impiety of this passage, we may feel disposed to smile at its absurdity. If we are not to be guided by "reason, or conscience, or the Holy Spirit, or by something else," upon what foundation are we to build our faith; or by what rule to regulate our practice. The answer to this inquiry may perhaps be found implicitly, if not explicitly, contained in a preceding part of the review. Attend to the preaching of the Gospel by a *set of men trained for the purpose*, being careful not to forget that the labourer is worthy of his price, and that those only who have received the Gospel freely, are bound to give it freely. We however, are not satisfied with such an answer, inasmuch as it appears evident, from Scripture testimony, that there can be no true Gospel ministry, unless the call and qualification proceed from the Spirit of

our Lord and Saviour, and that the dispensation under which the apostles were required to wait till they were endued with power from on high, before they attempted to promulgate the glad tidings of the Gospel, has never been changed. The inference is therefore clear and conclusive, that the *nature* of the qualification must be the same now as it was then. This being admitted, it follows that we must give up the plan of *training* young men for the ministry, or lay claim to a degree of inspiration which Friends have never professed. Unless parents and guardians can *foresee* that their children or wards will, or will not, upon attaining maturity, have a dispensation of the Gospel committed to them, it is impossible to know which of them to train for the ministry, and which for other avocations. His theory is therefore inconsistent with itself, as he denies divine inspiration and yet attempts to erect a system, which will not stand without it.

Though the reviewer has taken occasion in other passages as well as in this, to speak quite contemptuously of the doctrine of an *inward light*, he seems very much at a loss to conceive what it is. This may therefore be a proper place to explain what we mean by it.

It is not reason, for reason is only the power of comparing ideas, and deducing conclusions from principles which are known or assumed.

It is not conscience, for conscience is not a principle but a result, the consequence of our belief, or of the judgment to which we have arrived, whether correctly or not, in relation to our moral or religious duty. Thus the apostle speaks of some whose *conscience* was defiled. Tit. v. 15. "Conscience" says Barclay, "comes from conscire, and is that knowledge which ariseth in man's heart from what agreeth, contradicteth or is contrary to any thing believed by him, whereby he becomes *conscious* to himself that he transgresseth by doing that which he is persuaded he

ought not to do. So that the mind being once blinded or defiled with a wrong belief, there ariseth a conscience from that belief which troubles him if he goes against it. Thus if a papist eat flesh in lent, or be not diligent enough in the adoration of images, or if he should contemn images, his conscience would smite him for it, because his judgment is already blinded with a false belief concerning these things; whereas the light of Christ never consented to any of these abominations. Thus then man's natural conscience is sufficiently distinguished from it; for conscience followeth the judgment, doth not inform it; but this light, as it is received, removes the blindness of the judgment, opens the understanding, and rectifies both the judgment and the conscience."*

Though the term *inward light*, is not with Friends such a hackneyed phrase as a reader of the review and other similar productions might be led to suppose, we have no disposition to reject it. If the mind of man is *within* him, it would appear that whatever acts immediately on the mind, without the instrumentality of any thing cognizable by the senses, must be inward in its operation, whatever it may be in its nature and origin. If "there is a spirit *in* man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding," Job. xxxii. 8; and if "whatsoever doth make manifest is *light*," Eph. v. 13, there must be an *inward light*.

The doctrine then, which we advocate, is neither more nor less than what the Holy Scriptures bear witness to, in numerous passages. "The word is very nigh thee, in thy heart and in thy mouth," Duet. xxx. 14, which, the apostle adds, "Is the word of faith which we preach." "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my

* Apol. p. 146.

law in their *inward parts*, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord; for they shall all *know* me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord," Jer. xxxi. 33, 34. If this prediction is ever fulfilled, it must be by divine inspiration; for the testimony of Scripture, however excellent, is outward, and not written by the divine hand on the heart. It appears that in the Gospel day, to which this prophecy unquestionably alludes, it is possible for all to *know* the Lord. But our blessed Saviour testified, that "No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will *reveal* him," Matt. xi. 27. In the memorable conversation with his disciples, a short time before his crucifixion, the gracious promise was made: "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you *forever;* even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be *in* you." This is afterwards, in general terms, applied to others as well as to the immediate disciples. "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him; and *we* will come unto him, and make our abode with him." This Comforter, or Spirit of Truth, he told them, should teach them, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them, John, xiv. 16, &c. And again, after his resurrection, he appears to have closed his communication to his disciples with this memorable declaration: "And lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 20. The apostle asks, "Know ye not that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

This principle, which the reviewer takes so much pains to decry, is indeed the glory of the Christian dispensation.

"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not *revealed* it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. xvi. 17, 18. Now unless we adopt the popish exposition, that the church is built on Peter, we must agree that *Christ revealed* is the rock on which the true church was to be built. If, then, divine inspiration has ceased, the foundation is taken away, and what becomes of the church? We are told that the kingdom of heaven is *within* us; and that it is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. But it is represented by various similitudes; a grain of mustard seed—a little leaven—a net cast into the sea enclosing bad and good—illustrating the various appearances and operations of this divine principle, according to the different states of the subjects on whom it acts. Whether it appears as a witness against sin actually committed, bringing the mind under condemnation; as a monitor to warn against the presentation of evil; as a secret influence inclining the heart to love and revere the Author of our existence; as a teacher instructing us what we are required to do; or as a spirit of consolation affording a sensible evidence of the mercy and goodness of God; it is one and the same spirit, working toward the same end, the purification of the heart, and the salvation of the soul. And I would seriously put the question to any man, whether he has not frequently been sensible of secret impressions, in some of these ways, which he could not explain by referring them to the operations of the mind itself? Probably none, who are capable of reflection, will deny that they have often found their minds touched with feelings and apprehensions of a very serious character, which did not arise from voluntary effort, or discoverable association. If so, it is not so much in relation to facts, as to the explanation of

them, that we differ from others. Those gentle intimations of duty, or convictions for sin, which we all at times experience, are by many supposed to be something very different from the admonitions of the Spirit of Truth; and are therefore disregarded or explained away by a reference to some unknown influence, or imaginary association. Now we do not say that every impression which the mind perceives without understanding it, is a divine intimation, but we do say, that those impressions which we consider as of divine origin, are frequently so gentle, as to be readily overlooked. We do not imagine that we are favoured exclusively with the openings of divine counsel, but we attribute to this source what many others mistake for the unexplained and unimportant operations of the mind itself.* As in natural science the same phenomena are frequently accounted for by different theories, so it is in the case before us. But we observe in the former, that a theory which explains a phenomenon by referring it to its true principle, serves as a basis, or adds a link to the chain of other discoveries, while a false theory only darkens what it professes to explain, and leads to no useful result. Thus, though Des Cartes as well as Newton, was acquainted with the revolutions of the planets, yet the former accounted for them by a system of vortices, an explanation which led to no ulterior discovery, while the theory of Newton, being founded in truth, furnished the means to unravel, and subject to calculation, the whole complex system of the planetary motions. So if we regard any secret intimation which is really divine, as a mere childish fancy, we can scarcely fail to neglect it;

* The communication of motion from one body to another, is as inexplicable, as the communication of divine influences. We know nothing of force, any more than we do of grace, except by their effects.—GREGORY'S LETTERS.

but if we refer it to its true cause, we are much more likely to regard it with serious attention and be made acquainted with its saving effects. As both the senses and the intellect are rendered more acute by constant exercise, so the spiritual faculties, by reason of use, become more capable of discerning between good and evil. It is by attending to the monitions of wisdom, or the manifestations of divine light in its smaller appearances, that we can become partakers of its greatest benefits; for they only who are faithful in a little, have reason to expect that they shall be made rulers over more.

A correct theory is, therefore, of incalculable importance in religion as well as in science. Now the theory which we espouse, is not only supported by the direct testimony and general tenor of the Holy Scriptures, but is confirmed by the experience of thousands. For those who make it their constant care to seek for divine counsel in the secret of the soul, and to regard with reverence the openings of the word of life as inwardly manifested, do find to their unspeakable consolation, that there is a capacity afforded to distinguish between the suggestions of their own imagination, and the teachings of the Spirit of Truth. They find the Scripture declaration verified in their experience, that "the path of the just is as the shining light, which shines more and more to the perfect day." But when this gentle voice is rejected and despised as a mere phantom of the imagination, it is known only as a light shining in darkness, which the darkness neither comprehends nor regards. Hence it is, that though all have heard, in a greater or less degree, the voice of the true shepherd, yet many remain uninstructed by it. For the testimony is yet true, "as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God."

But the reviewer considers enthusiasm as the necessary consequence of a practical belief in the doctrine of the in-

ward light. It may be observed, that his reasoning, if reasoning it may be called, against the present existence of divine inspiration, would have been just as good in the days of the apostles, as it is now. The consequences of this belief are not peculiar to the present age, but must arise, if they arise at all, out of the nature of the case, and the character of the human mind. The conclusion would then be, that divine inspiration was never to be trusted as an unerring guide, and that those who believed in it must always have been enthusiasts. If, then, the Scriptures owe their excellence and their authority to their being given by divine inspiration, what, upon the reviewer's theory, are we to think of them? Does he not, by the blow aimed at the doctrine of the inward light, inflict a deadly wound upon the whole system of revealed religion? What would the most confirmed deist demand, which our professed advocate of Christianity has not conceded.

The reasoning of the apostle Paul has scarcely left us any alternative between absolute deism and the full admission of the doctrine for which we contend. "For what man knoweth the things of a man but the spirit of a man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are freely given us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." 2 Cor. ii. 11—14. This passage not only refutes the reviewer, but shows the ground of his opinion.

The assertion that the inward light has in the theory

of Friends "an office assigned to it which makes it paramount to God's word," is far from being a clear representation of the subject. If we attach to the expression, the meaning which Friends give to it, the question of paramount authority cannot possibly arise. For according to them, Christ is the *Word of God.* Rev. xix. 13. "The same which was in the beginning with God, and was God; in whom was life, and the life was the *light* of men." But the reviewer, I suppose, applies the term to the Scriptures. The force of his censure, then, depends upon the admission of two hypotheses, not distinctly expressed, though necessarily implied. First, that the inward light is mere imagination, some whim or fancy that may happen to strike the mind; an hypothesis which depends entirely upon his own unscriptural dogma, that "the days of inspiration have long since gone by." But the office which Friends assign to the inward light is no other than what the Scriptures assign to the Spirit of Truth. Their doctrine applies to "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." John, i. 9. If any mistake the suggestions of imagination for the revelations of the divine spirit, (and Friends have never denied that the hasty and inconsiderate may fall into such mistake) the error no more proves the fallacy of the doctrine, than the mistakes in Joseph Scaliger's pretended mathematical solutions, prove the fallacy of mathematical demonstration.

His second implied hypothesis is, that the inward light may lead to conclusions incompatible with Scripture testimony. Now we must remember, that the censure cast upon Friends for assigning the office they do to the inward light, is applied without distinction to each of his suppositions as to what this light is, and consequently to that of its being the Holy Spirit. But how can they give too much authority to the dictates of the Holy Spirit? Or how can an authority paramount to Scripture testi-

mony, assigned to the Spirit of Truth itself, derogate from the authority of Scripture, unless they disagree? And to suppose a disagreement, is to suppose either that the Spirit of Truth will lead into error, or that the Scriptures are erroneous. Now Friends have always held, that the Holy Scriptures were given by divine inspiration, and that they never are contradicted by the Holy Spirit in the mind of man; but on the contrary, that this spirit, when received and attended to, affords the most clear and satisfactory evidence of their truth. George Fox informs us, that when *he had openings*,* they answered to the Scriptures —that he had great openings in the Scriptures, and they were very precious to him. Journal, vol. I. pa. 7—28. In his preaching, his epistles, and his arguments with those who opposed him, he always appealed to the testimony of Scripture in support of his doctrines. Barclay observes, "we are very willing that all our doctrines and practices be tried by them; which we never refused, nor ever shall, in all controversies with our adversaries, as the judge and test. We shall also be very willing to admit it as a positive maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures, be counted and reckoned a delusion of the devil. For as we never lay claim to the Spirit's leadings, that we may cover ourselves in any thing that is evil; so we know that as every evil contradicteth the Scriptures, so it doth also the Spirit in the first place, from which the Scriptures came; and whose motions can never contradict one another." Apol. pa. 8.

In what school of theology our reviewer's studies were prosecuted, I am at a loss to conjecture, when I reflect,

* This word was used by him to indicate the revelations of divine truth, which he believed were often made to him.

that not only the writers of the Scriptures, and the fathers, so called, of the Christian church, as Augustine, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Gregory, &c. but the modern reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and others, supported the doctrine which he so unceremoniously condemns. Those who believe that inspiration has ceased, are much more likely to depend upon their *trained* preacher, and admit, without examination, the doctrine which he may deal out, than those who believe that a measure of the Spirit of Truth is given to every man to profit withal; that this is a spirit of judgment to them that sit in judgment; and that under its influence the ear trieth words as the mouth tasteth meat; and that they who do the will of our heavenly father, shall know whether the doctrine they hear is from him, or whether the preacher speaks of himself.

But we are told, that the most melancholy feature in our system is, that "it is unfriendly to an enlightened, active, scriptural piety." When we examine the reasons assigned by the reviewer for this assertion, we find the old doctrine of the middle ages, very thinly veiled—*pay the priest.* Our silent meetings, or very short sermons, do not, in his opinion, supply food for devotion. We read in the New Testament of some very short sermons. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." "Come see a man which told me all things that ever I did, is not this the Christ?" These were certainly shorter than most testimonies ever heard even in the meetings of Friends, yet they were effectual. The hearers were turned to the Saviour, and brought to believe on him. Hence we see that it is not the length or learning displayed, that gives value to a sermon, but the authority which accompanies it. As to silent meetings, it may be safely left to any practical Christian to decide, which is most conducive to real, ardent, heartfelt piety, the prostration of the soul

in solemn silence, before the throne of grace, to wait in humble adoration for instruction how to pray, and what to pray for; or listening, during an equal portion of time, to an eloquent discourse, composed at leisure in the closet, by one who is hired and paid for the purpose, and whose interest it evidently is to preach such doctrine as his employers will relish. It is not intended here to assert, that silent meetings always are what is here described, or that those who preach for a stipend always endeavour to suit their doctrines to the taste of their employers. Many of them, no doubt, endeavour to perform their duty religiously. But I speak of the design and object in the one case, and of the natural tendency of the system in the other.

It is frequently intimated, that the doctrines or the religion of Friends is not scriptural. A careful examination however, cannot fail to prove that in both these particulars, Friends are more strictly scriptural, than any of their opposers. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." James, i. 27. If this is scriptural religion, the admissions of the reviewer are sufficient to show that Friends are not behind others in regard to it. That they pay a very great regard to the Scriptures is obvious from what has been already shown. Of their care to have their children well acquainted with them, the following evidence may suffice.

Third Query. "Are Friends careful to bring up those under their direction, in plainness of speech, behaviour, and apparel; in frequent reading the Holy Scriptures; and to restrain them from reading pernicious books, and from the corrupt conversation of the world?"

"We tenderly and earnestly advise and exhort all parents and heads of families, that they endeavour to instruct their children and families in the doctrines and precepts of the Christian religion, as contained in the Scrip-

tures; and that they excite them to the diligent reading of those excellent writings, which plainly set forth the miraculous conception, birth, holy life, wonderful works, blessed example, meritorious death, and glorious resurrection, ascension and mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and to educate their children in the belief of those important truths, as well as in the belief of the inward manifestation and operation of the Holy Spirit on their own minds, that they may reap the benefit and advantage thereof, for their own peace and everlasting happiness; which is infinitely preferable to all other considerations." Discipline, page 100.

"This meeting doth earnestly exhort all parents, heads of families and guardians of minors, that they prevent, as much as in them lies, their children, and others under their care and tuition, from having or reading books and papers tending to prejudice the profession of the Christian religion, to create the least doubt concerning the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, or of those saving truths declared in them; lest their infant and feeble minds should be poisoned thereby, and a foundation laid for the greatest evils." Discipline, page 12.

Does all this prove the great deficiency of instruction, and want of scriptural knowledge, with which we are charged?

It is remarkable, that one principal reason why Friends are often charged with want of scriptural soundness is, that they confine themselves, in their expositions of the mysteries of religion, to the positive testimony of Scripture; and never attempt to supply by vague conjecture, what the sacred penmen thought right to withhold. Thus the reviewer tells us, they appear to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body: though he admits, "this is inferred rather from their total silence, or vague implication, than explicit denial." Now if we examine the writ-

ings of Friends, who have treated upon this subject, we find an express declaration of the belief, that there will be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust; but as the apostle declines deciding with what body they shall rise, Friends have not presumed to supply the omission.

"There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Nor is that body sown that shall be; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body: It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Barclay's Confession of Faith, art. 23. "We deny not, but believe the resurrection, according to the Scriptures, not only from sin, but also from death and the grave; but are conscientiously cautious in expressing the *manner* of the resurrection, because it is left a secret by the Holy Ghost in the Scripture. Should people be angry with them for not expressing or asserting what is hidden, and which is more curious than necessary to be known? Thou fool, is to the curious inquirer, as says the apostle: which makes the Quakers contented with that body which God shall please to give them hereafter; being assured that their corruptible shall put on incorruption, and their mortal shall put on immortality, but in such manner as pleaseth God. And in the mean time they esteem it their duty, as well as wisdom, to acquiesce in his holy will. It is enough, they believe a resurrection, and that with a glorious and *incorruptible body*, without further niceties; for to that was the ancient hope." Penn's Key, sec. 11. Vide also his testimony to the truth, art. 15. Reply to the

Bishop of Cork, Select Works, folio, page 826. Bates's Doctrine of Friends, page 26.

Their rejection of the sacraments, as they are usually termed, is often advanced as a heavy charge; almost, if not altogether, sufficient to unchristianise them. But here, as before, the difference arises from the closer adherence of Friends to the letter, as well as the spirit of the Scriptures. Supposing myself concerned with protestants only, no notice will be taken of those which they disallow. As the light of the reformation caused five out of seven of these ceremonials to vanish, it would appear, that Friends, by the rejection of the other two, had only carried the reformation, in those particulars, a little further than their protestant predecessors.

With regard to baptism, it may be observed, that the advocates of water baptism, when they attempt to prove it a divine command, rely chiefly on the text, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. xxviii. 19. As nothing is here said respecting *water*, how does this text prove that water must be used. To say that *water* must be understood, is to beg the question, not to prove the position; a mode of arguing which affords presumptive evidence that the question at issue cannot be satisfactorily proved. The expression teach (or rather disciple or proselyte) all nations, baptizing them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; strongly indicates that these acts were to be simultaneous. And this construction is confirmed by the command to tarry at Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high. We accordingly find that the baptism of the Holy Ghost did attend the preaching of the apostles; as in the case of Cornelius and others assembled at his house. Acts, x. 44.

Another consideration, however, appears to me conclu-

sive on the subject. We find two baptisms, totally distinct from each other, clearly recognised in the New Testament. The baptism of John, which was with water; and the baptism of Christ with the Holy Ghost. The former a preparatory and decreasing dispensation; the latter an increasing and abiding one. Matt. iii. 3. 11. Luke, i. 76. 33. John, iii. 28. 30. Now, when Christ commanded *his* disciples to *baptize*, without expressly declaring to what baptism he alluded, the necessary construction is, that he meant his own. Had any other been intended, it must, to make the matter clear, have been expressed; but if his own was intended, no such specification was necessary. Let us take as an illustration, the article of the federal constitution, which declares, that the president shall see that *the laws* be faithfully executed. Could there be a doubt as to *what laws* were intended? Or would any lawyer hesitate to decide that the words, "of the United States," were totally needless, and, if used, would have been sheer tautology? Again, the disciples were commanded to *teach*. To teach what? The philosophy of Aristotle? Or rather to proselyte. To proselyte to what? The law of Moses? To the doctrines of the Pharisees? Assuredly they were to teach the doctrines of Christianity; to proselyte all nations to the faith of Christ. If then we cannot, without the most glaring absurdity, apply the first part of the commission to any other doctrines than those which belong to the dispensation of Christ; what authority can we find for changing the application of the concluding part? Must we suppose that one part of the sentence relates to the doctrines of Christ, and the other to the dispensation of John?

If all nations are at any time to be converted to Christianity, and to be baptised with water, as a part of that dispensation, it is not easy to discover in what manner John's own prediction is to be accomplished. His dispen-

sation would, upon that supposition, continue to increase; and would be at all times co-extensive with that which, according to his own testimony, was to supersede it.

When baptism is mentioned as necessary to salvation, nothing appears to prove that *water* was intended. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." Mark, xvi. 16. The antitype* "whereof, baptism, doth now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. iii. 21. As the apostle declares, "there is one Lord, one faith, *one baptism*," Eph. iv. 5, and the Scriptures no where assert that the baptism with water is that *one baptism*, but on the contrary clearly prove that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the one true Christian baptism, those who would unchristianize the Society of Friends because they reject the watery dispensation, must find some other standard of Christianity than the New Testament. But how those who contend for water baptism, as a Christian ordinance, can justify to themselves the rejection of baptism, and the introduction of a substitute which has neither precept nor practice in Scripture to support it, is not easily understood. For the sprinkling of infants is not even the baptism of John.

A little examination will be sufficient to show, that Friends are no less scriptural in regard to the Lord's supper, than they are in relation to baptism. And here, it is to be observed, that a doctrine, deducible by superficial examination, from one or two isolated texts, in opposition to the general tenor of the New Testament, is not properly a Scriptural doctrine. That construction which

---

* I have here substituted for the expression, *the like figure*, given in the common translation, that which the Greek, Αντιτυπον, manifestly requires.

is sustained by the general scope as well as by single texts, must be considered as the genuine one. Now what, according to the general tenor of the Scriptures, were the legal ceremonies, but types and shadows of the more spiritual religion which was introduced by the coming of Christ? (See particularly the epistle to the Hebrews). What was the passover, but a type of the one great offering for the redemption of the world? In the institution of this feast, the time and manner of its observance were clearly explained. Nothing was left to conjecture. We might therefore expect that a ceremony of a similar character, which was to be observed by the whole Christian world, would be no less clearly explained. The numerous disputes, however, among Christian professors, respecting the time, and manner, and frequency of its observance, as well as an inspection of those passages from which the obligation is inferred, are sufficient evidence that we are not furnished with such precise direction on this subject, as the Israelites were. The disputes respecting the character of the eucharist itself, furnish no small reason to suspect the existence of some radical error, common to all the disputants. The Romanists insist that the words, *this is my body*, must be understood as literally true, not only when applied to the bread used by Christ himself, but to that now consecrated by the priest; while Luther and his followers allow that the bread and wine retain their substance, but that the body and blood of Christ are also present in them; but Calvin denies this doctrine, asserting that the bread and wine are not the body and blood of Christ, but that both his body and blood are sacramentally received by the faithful in the use of bread and wine.

But Friends, without puzzling themselves with such inexplicable theories, perceive in the narrative of our Saviour's last supper with his disciples, a plain account of

a Jewish ceremony, which he, in fulfilment of the Mosaic law, was careful to observe. And in this case, as well as others, he took occasion to turn their attention from the type to the antitype; from the paschal lamb to himself, "the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." And inasmuch as the Jews were in the habit of considering this feast, as a commemoration of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage; they, being Jews, and therefore likely for a time to continue the observance, were thenceforth to view it as applied to the greater deliverance which he offered to those who believe and receive him. "This do *in remembrance of me.*" Luke, xxii. 19. That no institution of a new ceremony was intended, appears clear from the circumstance, that in neither Matthew, Mark or John, can we find any thing like a command to observe it in future. The two former both mention the application of the passover to himself; thus giving substantially the same information with Luke; but omitting only the words which seem to imply that the practice was to continue. Thus proving conclusively that the application, not the future observance of the ceremony, was the real object of the communication.

The evangelist John, who certainly understood the meaning of his Lord's injunctions as clearly as any of them, passes over the subject of the last supper very briefly; yet he lays down, in another chapter, the doctrine inculcated in this place by the other evangelists, more strongly than either of them. "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. I am the true bread which came down from heaven. If a man eat of this bread he shall live forever." John, vi. 51. 53, 54. This however is declared to be spiritual: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the words that

I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," verse 63. These passages, viewed in connection with the general tenor of the Christian dispensation, clearly prove that the object was not to add a new ceremony to those with which the Jewish church was sufficiently burthened, nor to perpetuate an old one, but to spiritualize those with which the disciples were already acquainted. In the memorable decision of the apostles and elders on the question of circumcision, we find these remarkable words, relative to outward observances. "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." In the enumeration which follows, we find no trace of the sacraments, so called, as we may reasonably suppose we should, if the assembly then convened had judged them an essential part of the Christian religion.

The expostulation of the apostle Paul with the Corinthians, is unquestionably a severe and just rebuke, for the shameful manner in which they practiced this ceremony: and I doubt not Friends will agree with him, that if the thing is observed as a memorial of our Saviour's last supper with his disciples, it ought to be done seriously, and with a solemn remembrance of him. If Christians are enjoined to press after the spiritual communion of the body and blood of Christ, it is no wonder the apostle should express, in energetic terms, his disapprobation of the practice of converting the typical representation of this communion into an occasion of rioting and drunkenness. But to infer from this expostulation, that Christians of all countries and generations, are required to observe the outward rite, is neither to follow the letter nor the spirit of the passage. Those who desire to see the doctrines of Friends on this subject fully explained, are referred to Barclay's Apology, Prop. 13. Joseph Phipps' Treatise on Baptism.

Another point on which they have been frequently

charged with unsoundness, and for a similar reason, is in relation to the doctrine of the trinity. For it will be easy to prove that what they reject is not the testimony of Scripture, but the inventions and interpolations of men. As the word, trinity, or one God existing in three distinct persons, can no where be found in the sacred writings, the rejection of the term and this definition of it, is certainly no evidence of deficiency in scriptural soundness. Now the truth is, that Friends have always acknowledged the text, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one;" 1 John, v. 6. which the unitarians so strenuously oppose as a trinitarian interpolation. And this was done, not on the ground of historical evidence alone, but also because the doctrine is consistent with numerous other portions of Scripture; and appears indeed an essential part of the great Christian system. See John, i. 5. 10. 14. x. 30. xiv. 10. 30. xvi. 13—16. George Fox, in his "Answer to such as falsely say the Quakers are no Christians," uses these words: "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth; for there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one, &c. And now, let none be offended, because we do not call them by those unscriptural names, of trinity, and three persons, which are not scripture words; and so do falsely say, that we deny the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; which three are one that bear record in heaven, &c. which three we own with all our hearts, as the apostle John did, and as all true Christians ever did, and now do; and if you say we are not Christians, because we do not call the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the trinity, distinct and separate persons, then you may as well conclude that John was no Christian, who did not give the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost these names." pa. 26. Declara-

tions of similar import are found in the works of Barclay, Penn, Whitehead, Pennington, Howgill, &c. See Evans's Exposition.

To prove the belief of Friends in the divinity and offices of Christ, and the consistency of that belief with the testimony of the scriptures, the following may suffice. "First, then, we renounce all natural power and ability in ourselves, in order to bring us out of our lost and fallen condition, and first nature, and confess, that as of ourselves, we are able to do nothing that is good, so neither can we procure remission of sins or justification by any act of our own, so as to merit it, or draw it as a debt from God, due unto us; but we acknowledge all to be of and from his love, which is the original and fundamental cause of our acceptance.*

"Secondly. God manifested this love towards us in the sending of his beloved son, the Lord Jesus Christ, into the world, who gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling-savour; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, that he might reconcile us unto himself, and by the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot unto God, and suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God.

---

* This passage completely disproves the assertion of the reviewer that "nearly all Quakers agree in the notion, that their salvation depends, not on the sovereign grace of God, in implanting a new principle in the soul, but on their own diligent efforts in cultivating a principle which originally belongs to them." There is probably no doctrine more clearly and frequently inculcated among us, than that if we are saved, our salvation must be effected by the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord; and if we are lost, our perdition will be of ourselves in consequence of our refusing to submit to the saving operation of this grace.

"Thirdly. Forasmuch as all men who have come to man's estate, (the man Jesus only excepted) have sinned, therefore all have need of this Saviour, to remove the wrath of God from them due to their offences; in this respect he is truly said to have borne the iniquities of us all in his body on the tree, and therefore is the only Mediator, having quailfied the wrath of God towards us; so that our former sins stand not in our way, being by virtue of his most satisfactory sacrifice, removed and pardoned. Neither do we think that remission of sins is to be expected, sought or obtained any other way, or by any works or sacrifice whatever; though they may come to partake of this remission, that are ignorant of the history. So, then, Christ by his death and sufferings hath reconciled us to God, even while we are enemies; that is, he offers reconciliation unto us; we are put into a capacity of being reconciled; God is willing to forgive us our iniquities, and to accept us, as is well expressed by the apostle, 2 Cor. v. 19. 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath put in us the word of reconciliation.' And therefore the apostle in the next verses, intreats them in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God, intimating that the wrath of God being removed by the obedience of Christ Jesus, he is willing to be reconciled unto them, and ready to remit the sins that are past, if they repent.

"We consider then our redemption in a twofold respect or state, both which in their own nature are perfect, though in their application to us, the one is not, nor can be, without respect to the other.

"The first is the redemption performed and accomplished by Christ for us in his crucified body without us; the other is the redemption wrought by Christ in us; which

is no less properly called, and accounted a redemption than the former. The first then is that whereby a man, as he stands in the fall, is put into a capacity of salvation, and hath conveyed unto him a measure of that power, virtue, spirit, life, and grace that was in Christ Jesus, which as the free gift of God, is able to counterbalance, overcome, and root out the evil seed wherewith we are naturally, as in the fall, leavened.

"The second is that whereby we witness and know this pure and perfect redemption *in ourselves*, purifying, cleansing, and redeeming us from the power of corruption, and bringing us into unity, favour and friendship with God." Barclay's Apology, page 202—204.

"Though we place remission of sins in the righteousness and obedience of Christ performed by him in the flesh, as to what pertains to the remote procuring cause, and that we hold ourselves formally justified by Christ Jesus formed and brought forth in us, yet we cannot, as some protestants have unwarily done, exclude works from justification. For though properly we be not justified *for them*, yet are we justified *in them;* and they are necessary, even as causa sine qua non, i. e. the cause without which none are justified." Ibid. page 207. Similar doctrines are repeatedly professed by William Penn; particularly in his Primitive Christianity Revived. The same doctrine appears in the writings of I. Pennington, E. Burough, F. Howgill, and others.

The following is extracted from a declaration of faith presented to the British Parliament in 1689, signed by a number of Friends. It is in the form of question and answer.

"Question. Do you believe the divinity and humanity of Jesus Christ the eternal son of God, or that Jesus Christ is truly God and man?

"Answer. Yes, we verily believe that Jesus Christ is

truly God and man, according as the Holy Scriptures testify of him; God over all blessed forever; the true God and eternal life; the one Mediator between God and man, even the man Christ Jesus.

"Question. Do you believe and expect salvation and justification, by the righteousness and merits of Jesus Christ, or by your own righteousness or works?

"Answer. By Jesus Christ, his righteousness, merits and works, and not by our own: God is not indebted to us for our deservings, but we to him for his free grace in Christ Jesus, whereby we are saved through faith in him, not of ourselves, and by his grace enabled truly and acceptably to serve and follow him as he requires. He is our all in all, who worketh all in us that is well pleasing to God.

"Question. Do you believe remission of sins and redemption through the sufferings, death and blood of Christ?

"Answer. Yes, through faith in him, as he suffered and died for all men, gave himself a ransom for all, and his blood being shed for the remission of sins, so all they who sincerely believe and obey him, receive the benefits and blessed effects of his suffering and dying for them; they, by faith in his name, receive and partake of that eternal redemption which he hath obtained for us, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity; he died for our sins, and rose again for our justification; and if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sin."

As a conclusion to this account of the doctrines of Friends, it may be observed, that the apprehension which the reviewer seems to entertain relative to the effect of a belief in the present existence of divine revelation, appears to me entirely groundless. He seems to suppose that this belief must lead to a disregard for the Holy Scriptures.

As if a conviction that the humble followers of Christ, in the present day, are endued with a measure of the same spirit that dictated those invaluable writings, could diminish our esteem for them. The apprehension, indeed, depends for all its plausibility, upon his own gratuitous assumption, that "the days of inspiration are past;" and consequently that the belief in it is nothing but fanaticism. But, for any thing he has *proved*, the doctrine of Friends upon this subject, *may* be true; and, unless the Scriptures are no less mystical than he represents the writings of Friends to be, it *must* be true. If it is true, a result diametrically opposite to that supposed by him, appears inevitable. In whatever direction we turn our attention, we find men always pleased with the productions of congenial minds. The mind in which piety predominates, loves to dwell upon the experience and reflections of those who have trod the path before them. The mathematician pores with delight over the volumes of Newton and La Place; the man of poetic fancy gives his days and nights to the works of Homer and Milton; the chemist traces with eagerness the steps of Lavoisier and Davy; the lover of fictitious adventure ingulphs with voracity the productions of Scott and Voltaire; and even the writings of Dr. Cox may be read and admired.

The arguments in support of the truth and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, which are addressed to the understanding, and by which the cavils of the infidel are successfully exposed, are as accessible to those who admit the doctrine of an inward light, as to those that oppose it. There is nothing in this doctrine, which indisposes the mind to yield a rational assent to the force of historical evidence, or prevents the understanding from being properly impressed with the numerous conclusive arguments, which learning and ingenuity have advanced, in favour of the Christian religion. On the other hand, a sincere belief in

the actual fulfilment of the gracious promises with which the sacred writings abound, and a practical experience of the operation of divine grace, agreeably to Scripture testimony, must unavoidably render the Scriptures both more instructive and more delightful. We accordingly find that those who pay the most scrupulous regard to the unfoldings of the Spirit of Truth upon their own minds, are among the most diligent readers of the Holy Scriptures. And the fact, that the admission of this doctrine, and a practical conformity to it, always lead to this result, is no inconsiderable evidence of the correctness of the doctrine itself.

The reviewer avows that the doctrine of an inward light is unfavourable to missionary effort; and broadly insinuates that Friends are disposed to leave the conversion of the heathen entirely to the silent operations of this principle. Holding the opinions they do in regard to Gospel ministry, it is not to be expected that they should unite with others, or be active themselves, in *hiring* persons to go and preach to the heathen nations. It is, however, well known, that Friends both in Europe and America, have taken a very active part in the distribution of the Holy Scriptures. Where have the poor benighted Africans found so many, and such zealous friends, as among the members of this society? And we must observe, that the promotion of their physical comfort has always constituted but a part of the object which Friends have laboured to attain. From the time of George Fox, who in the year 1671, when he visited Barbadoes, made them the object of his paternal solicitude, to the present day, their improvement in morals and religion has engaged the attention of this society. While even Connecticut, in imitation of her sisters of the south, prohibits by legal penalties the establishment of schools for their instruction, Friends have been long employed in diffusing the benefits of education among

them. It was Pennsylvania, whose system of government was originally modelled by the benevolent Penn, and where the principles of this society have made a stronger impression on public opinion than in any other state of the Union, that first broke the shackles of the slave.*

If we look to the treatment which the Indians have received from the settlers of the different colonies, we shall readily perceive, that the course pursued by William Penn, and his successors in religious profession, was incomparably superior to that of most other colonists. Contrast the peaceful intercourse which existed between those people and the early settlers of Pennsylvania, with the barbarous wars in New England, and then say, which were most likely, the Pennsylvania Quakers, or the New England Calvanists, to evangelize those heathen nations. Had the people of these United States generally adopted the policy, or rather the religious integrity, of William Penn and his brethren, in relation to these people, it is hardly probable there would, at this day, have been an heathen Indian in the vicinity of the white settlers. If William Penn was able, in the few busy years which he spent in America, to make so deep an impression on the minds of these untutored sons of the forest, what might not the same treatment have effected, if uniformly continued for a century and a half? Their love for their bene-

---

* In justice to Massachusetts, it may be observed, that the convention which formed the constitution of the state, closed its session but one day after the Pennsylvania law for the abolition of slavery was ratified; and that a clause similar to the first part of the declaration of independence, being introduced into the constitution, it was afterwards judicially determined that slavery was unconstitutional in that state. In Pennsylvania, however, its abolition was a direct legislative act.

factors would naturally have been transferred to the religion which they saw productive of such excellent fruit. But when they discovered that the superior intelligence of many professors of Christianity, was employed to overreach and defraud them; and that their religion permitted them to engage in wars no less savage and exterminating than those to which they were themselves accustomed; what was more natural than a belief that the Christian religion was even more odious than their own barbarous theology? If, again, these uninstructed heathens could be brought to adopt the opinion of the reviewer, that the religion of Friends, from whom they have experienced such uniform kindness,* is only an adulterated kind of Christi-

* At the time when a treaty was on hand at Canandaigua, in 1794, between the United States and the Six Nations, four chiefs, deputed by the grand council, waited upon some Friends, who at their request, had attended there to afford any assistance, which might be in their power to prevent the effusion of blood, and if possible to calm and settle the minds of the Indians. Red Jacket, on behalf of the deputation, after some introductory observations, said: "We who are now here, are but children, the ancients being deceased. We know that your fathers and ours, transacted business together, and that you look up to the Great Spirit for his direction and assistance, and take no part in war. We suppose you were all born on this island, and we consider you as brethren; for though your ancestors came over this water, and ours were born here, this ought to be no impediment to our considering each other as brethren. Brothers you all know the proposals that have been made by Connitsutty, (the commissioner, T. Pickering,) as well as the offers made by us to him. We are all now in the presence of the Great Spirit, and we place more confidence in you than in any other people. As you expressed your desire for peace, we now desire your help and assistance; we hope you will not

anity, or the more sweeping dogma of his author, that it is no Christianity at all, while the first settlers in New England, who retaliated upon their Indian opponents all the barbarities of American war, who hanged the Quakers merely for being Quakers, and each other for imaginary crimes, are to be esteemed genuine, if not perfectly orthodox Christians, they could scarcely fail to view the profession of the Christian religion with the utmost abhorrence. Surely the writer who propagates such opinions as these, ought to be cautious of reproaching others with indifference in regard to the conversion of the heathen.

While on the subject of converting the heathen, I must take the liberty of copying a missionary tale from Elias Boudinot's Star in the West. The narrative may perhaps be of use to some of those who may hereafter incline to apply their time and talents to a similar object.

"The writer of these sheets," he says, "was, many years ago, one of the corresponding members of a society in Scotland, for promoting the Gospel among the Indians. To further this great work, they educated two young men of very serious and religious dispositions, and who were

---

deceive us; if you should do so, we shall no more place any confidence in mankind." Friends, after deliberation, returned them an answer, and Red Jacket in recapitulating the subjects, thanked them for their advice, and said, although Friends might account it of small value, they did not consider it so, but thought it would afford them considerable strength. [Relation of William Savery, who was present.] In numerous other instances, as well as in this, they have evinced their reliance in the integrity of Friends, frequently declaring, that of all people, our society only have sought to promote their real comfort and welfare. And I would put it to the most virulent opponents of the society, to produce an instance in which that confidence has been betrayed.

desirous of undertaking the mission for this special purpose. When they were ordained and ready to depart, we wrote a letter in the Indian style, to the Delaware nation, then residing on the north-west of the Ohio, informing that we had, by the goodness of the Great Spirit, been favoured with a knowledge of his will, as to the worship he required of his creatures, and the means he would bless to promote the happiness of man, both in this life and in that which was to come. That thus enjoying so much happiness ourselves, we could not but think of our red brethren in the wilderness, and wished to communicate the glad tidings to them, that they might be partakers with us. We had therefore sent them two ministers of the Gospel, who would teach them these great things; and earnestly recommended them to their careful attention. With proper passports the missionaries set off, and arrived in safety at one of their principal towns.

"The chiefs of the nation were called together, who answered them, that they would take it into consideration, and in the mean time they might instruct their women, but they should not speak to the men. They spent fourteen days in council, and then dismissed them very courteously with an answer to us. This answer made great acknowledgments for the favour we had done them. They rejoiced exceedingly at our happiness in thus being favoured by the Great Spirit; and felt very grateful that we had condescended to remember our brethren in the wilderness. But they could not help recollecting, that we had a people among us, whom, because they differred from us in colour, we made slaves of, and made them suffer great hardships, and lead miserable lives. Now they could not see any reason, if a people being *black*, entitled us thus to deal with them, why a *red colour* would not equally justify the same treatment. They therefore had determined to wait, to see whether all the black people among us were

made thus happy and joyful, before they could put confidence in our promises; for they thought a people who had suffered so much and so long by our means, should be entitled to our first attention; they had therefore sent back the two missionaries, with many thanks, promising, that when they saw the black people among us restored to freedom and happiness, they would gladly receive our missionaries."

Contrast this circumstance with one that occurred in the autumn of 1803. Friends of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting being engaged in promoting the civilization and improvement of the Indians residing in the western parts of New York, a few individuals paid a visit to them at the time above mentioned. While sitting one evening with the chief warrior, at Catarawgus, he said he wished to ask them a question, but was almost afraid. They desired him to speak, assuring him of their willingness to give him such information as they could. His question was, "Do the Quakers keep any slaves?" Upon being told they did not, he said he was very glad to hear it, for if they had, he could not have thought so well of them as he now did. That he had been at the city Washington, and observed that many white people kept the blacks in slavery, and used them no better than horses. [Report of committee for improving the condition of the Indians, pa. 43.] If a similar question had been put to Presbyterian missionaries, what reply could they have made?

The reviewer is probably unacquainted with the exertions of Friends in Pennsylvania, and the adjacent states, to promote the civilization of the Indian natives. It is, however, true, that the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia*

* This meeting is composed of Friends residing in New Jersey, Delaware, and the eastern parts of Pennsylvania. It is therefore to be observed, that what is said respecting Friends of

has ever since the year 1795, had a standing committee charged with this business; that during great part of this time, some Friends have been stationed among the Indians, or in their immediate vicinity, for the purpose of instructing them; and that in the prosecution of this benevolent work, more than sixty thousand dollars have been expended out of funds raised entirely within the limits of the society. The jealousy which the want of good faith on the part of the white settlers, has excited in the minds of these people, may be assigned as one reason why the efforts of Friends have not been productive of more extensive and conspicuous advantages. They very naturally conclude that the perfidy so frequently associated with the arts of civilized life, had some necessary connection with them; they therefore fear that their children by learning the arts, will acquire also the vices of their more enlightened neighbours. And this fear is not entirely dissipated by the confidence, great as it is, which they generally repose in the integrity of Friends. Still their situation at the present day, compared with what it was forty years ago, sufficiently proves their capacity for civilization. The exertions of Friends for improving their situation, not in the vicinity of Pennsylvania only, but wherever any considerable number of the society have resided in their neighborhood, as well as the visits frequently paid to them by our ministers, fully refute the assertion of the reviewer, that the doctrine of an inward light leads to apathy in regard to active exertion for the extension of Christian principles. Indeed, this very doctrine which he has taken so much pains to *ridicule*, for I can hardly admit that he has produced any *arguments*, to disprove it, has been found, even among these unlettered tenants of the wilder-

---

Pennsylvania, is generally applicable those of New Jersey and Delaware.

ness, productive of the most salutary effects. Of this, Papoonahoal, was a remarkable instance. This Indian, without the assistance of books, or outward instruction, but by the operation of the Divine Spirit upon his own mind, was converted from a dissolute life to one of exemplary piety; and became, like Noah of old, a preacher of righteousness to his countrymen. The rarity of instances like this, shows the importance of religious instruction, but their occurring at all, proves the *sufficiency* of the inward grace.

Having, as I conceive, sufficiently exposed the errors of the reviewer, I shall, after his example, close my communication with a friendly admonition. That, before he again attempts either to explain or ridicule the doctrines of any religious society, he would be at the trouble of informing himself what those doctrines really are; lest by indulging a zeal that has more warmth than light, he should be found in the predicament against which the prudent Gamaliel cautioned his brethren. Acts, v. 39.





C 8345.190.10
Vindication of the Society of Frien
Widener Library 003287195
3 2044 081 822 215